

One of the reasons is we do not have adequate enforcement in rural America. The strike force, the drug strike force, the special groups that have been put together to work in urban America and suburban America, they do not like to work out in rural America. Because we do not have adequate enforcement, drug usage is on the rise, and we are losing young people by the thousands because drugs, not only harm young people, they often kill them. Drugs are dangerous. Drugs are not healthy. Drugs are not safe. We must somehow stop the drug culture in all of America and specifically rural America.

A question I ask: Is rural America prepared for e-commerce? Do we have adequate ability to the Web, to the Internet? Are our telephone systems up to date? Do we have digital switching? Do we have an adequate amount of fiber optics? Because if we do not, it will be no different than if we do not have highways and we do not have rail and we do not have air service. E-commerce is where the future is.

One of the issues is equity in education. Rural school districts have historically been underfunded in comparison to urban and suburban districts. Suburban America has a strong tax base and can afford a good educational system. Urban America has some of the similar problems of rural. We have always subsidized them. But we have not subsidized rural education in the same manner that we have subsidized urban education. So rural education has had to take a back seat. Not all of the opportunities that are needed for our young people are there.

One of the issues facing this country and rural America is, do we have adequate access to technical education. My answer is no. The jobs that are out there today, many of them are high-tech jobs, many of them are mid-tech jobs. But we need an education that is a blend of academic and technology.

America is not prepared in my view, and rural America very much so, not prepared for the jobs of tomorrow, not prepared for the jobs of today. We are not adequately training the workforce. What is going to happen if we do not prepare this technical workforce, we are going to export another level of manufacturing that we should not lose and we do not need to lose if we do not prepare the workforce for the manufacturing companies.

The manufacturing companies that are still processing and manufacturing in America today are very high-tech. There is a computer and a robot hooked together all the way down the line. It is a very high-tech manufacturing, and it takes a worker far more than was needed in the past when one just needed a willing worker. One needs a person today that is trained.

ELIMINATION ON BAN ON IMPORTING TO UNITED STATES IRANIAN CAVIAR, CARPETS, AND PISTACHIOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for this opportunity, because I was not on the list to address the House today and did not expect to do so. My remarks may be intemperate because I come here in anger. I speak here not with any prepared text, but from a few roughly thrown together notes. I know those who prepare the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD like a prepared text to follow afterwards, but they will, unfortunately, have to rely upon our outstanding court reporter.

Mr. Speaker, 20 minutes ago, I became aware of a horrifying news report, a report that filled me with anger at a proposed administration policy, a policy that may be taken by an administration that I have supported time and time again with my vote and with my voice.

Today, news reports indicate that this Friday the State Department plans to announce an elimination on the ban on importing to the United States of Iranian caviar, carpets, and pistachios. We will be told that these three exports are insignificant to a Nation with so much oil. But Iran is able to export its oil on the world market and obtain the world price. Nothing America does influences that price or the total demand for Iranian oil.

□ 1945

In contrast, Iran stands to benefit substantially if its three major non-energy exports are allowed into the United States. Nothing we do could have a greater impact in the area of importing goods from Iran than to allow carpets, pistachios, and caviar into our markets.

Mr. Speaker, do we really need Iranian caviar? The Russian caviar somehow does not satisfy the palates of the most discriminating? I do not think so. I think the greater thirst, the greater craving than for Iranian caviar is the thirst, the craving in the State Department to make concessions of a tangible nature to Iran before we get more than the first wisp of improved Iranian behavior.

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, 13 Jews were arrested in Shiraz, Iran; and they were charged with espionage for the United States. Ten of those 13 remain in prison. All 13 go to trial next month. All of them face the death penalty. Why would America liberalize our export rules while these 13 face the death penalty for allegedly spying for us?

Mr. Speaker, since the Iranian revolution, 17 members of the Jewish community have been executed at roughly

the rate of one per year in a constant and bloody effort at community repression, and yet our State Department wants to let in the caviar, the carpets. Mr. Speaker, that caviar will not taste good. There is blood in the caviar; the carpets wrap human bodies. And we have got to stand firm for once.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States has said that Iran's treatment of the 13 Jews held in Shiraz would be a test for the Iranian government. But what test proctor is so wimpish as to award an A to the student before that student even turns in a paper? The test is still outstanding. Can Iran stop its repression of the oldest Jewish community outside of Israel? Can they let go of the desire of some of the hard-liners in Iran to oppress this small remaining community of 30,000 people?

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand how stupid and outrageous these espionage charges are. Here in the United States we are a multiethnic society. Anyone can grow up to be a spy. We can have Jewish-American spies, Chinese-American spies, or English-American spies, because everyone participates in our society. In Iran, no Jew is allowed anywhere near anything of strategic significance, and America would not be the world's only superpower if we made a practice of hiring as our spies those in a small community prohibited from getting anywhere close to any of the information we might find significant.

Mr. Speaker, these 13 are not held out of a genuine belief that they might be guilty of espionage, but rather as an effort to torture a community and perhaps execute 13 of its members.

Mr. Speaker, there is blood in the caviar, bodies have been wrapped in the carpets, and it is time for America to say no until the 13 Jews of Shiraz are liberated and until the Iranian government takes other important actions as well.

TIMELY TOPICS FOR A NIGHT-SIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is time for another night-side chat. I look forward to visiting with my colleagues in the next few minutes. There are a number of topics I would like to cover this evening, but first and foremost I have just listened to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and his points on caviar from Iran. The gentleman's comments were excellent, and they were right on point.

It is amazing how the administration, in my opinion, is dealing with the oil situation that we have got, the high

gasoline prices that all of our constituents pay out there, yet this week they are going to lift the restraints and allow Iran, which is a member of OPEC, to go ahead and trade these products in our country. When we consider even further what the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has said in regards to the terrorist acts and the problems that we have had with the country of Iran, it makes it even more astonishing that the administration would lift those trade restraints and allow Iran to come in here and trade as if they are our neighbors in our neighborhood. It does not make sense.

I had to put my two bits in on that because I think it is important and because I want to talk a little this evening about gasoline prices. It has hit all of us across this country.

I also want to talk about my case of the week. As many of my colleagues know, I used to be a police officer; and I like to highlight some of the more absurd cases I read about in our national press. This week's case comes out of the State of Colorado, my home State.

I want to talk a little about law enforcement and our drug enforcement in the State of Colorado. We have a lot of good hard-working law enforcement officers in Colorado.

And then, finally, colleagues, I wanted to talk about probably the most important topic of this evening: guns. Guns. A little controversy later on in the discussion, so I hope my colleagues will stay around because I want to talk about guns and what kind of situation we have got with guns. I want to talk about gun squads. I want to talk about guns, and I think at the conclusion of those remarks, my colleagues will walk out of this Chamber supporting what we are doing in the State of Colorado in regards to guns.

Let us start at the top. Let us start talking about gasoline prices. We all know what is happening at the pump. And, by the way, I have heard a few news commentators say, gosh, we have nothing to complain about, look at the gas prices in Europe. Well, let me just say that we should not compare the gas prices in Europe with the gas price in the United States because the gas price in Europe is not comprised of extra cost of production; it is taxes. It is extra taxes in Europe.

I do not think we in this country ought to sit idly by and say we ought to raise our price of gasoline, just like the Europeans do, which means we are going to put a substantial tax increase on our gas prices. I think our country has every reason to object to the high prices of gasoline as we now see it. Our entire economy is dependent upon fuel and oil.

Now, sure, we would like to lessen that dependence in the future. In fact, during the oil crisis in the 1970s we had a very aggressive drive to reduce our dependence on oil; but in fact we in-

creased our dependence on oil, to the extent that we are much more dependent today on foreign oil than we were after the crisis in the 1970s, when we said we were going to be less dependent. A number of different factors played into that.

Now, it is very easy to condemn oil. I deal with a number of people that are anti-oil. They think it is all big corporations, or they think this country has deserves what it gets in regards to oil. Well, if we really take a look at how fundamental it is, in fact there is not in this great room of ours, nothing, whether it is the furniture, whether it is the vehicles we use to get here, the electricity that lights the facility or powers this microphone or works TV cameras, all of this is very dependent upon this fuel. If we did not have this fuel, if the price gets out of hand, we will have an economic crisis. And when we have an economic crisis, that means we cannot do a lot of things that we think are good in our society, things like helping other countries, things like helping our own people, things like providing a strong military defense, things like providing health care, Medicare, Social Security. All of that is very dependent on a healthy economy.

And when we look at our economy, the foundation of our economy, we have several pillars. One is good people. We have good people in this country. We have efficiency. We have economies of scale in this country. We have expertise. We have education. But amongst those pillars is oil, and we have to have decently priced oil. It is essential for us.

Now, I want to point out that I have a disagreement with the Vice President's policy, as I take it, on oil. The Vice President's policy has been stated in a book that he wrote in 1992. Raise the taxes. My disagreement with the Vice President's policy and the administration's policy is that they should not be raising taxes on fuel. We are trying to get the gasoline price down, not take the gasoline price up. We cannot just continue to layer tax after tax after tax on the American people.

I should point out again my disagreement with the Vice President. That was the tie-breaking vote in 1994, when the gasoline taxes were raised 4.3 cents per gallon. That may not sound like a lot, until we think about one of these poor working people that has to go to work every day who are pulling into a gas pump. They did not see a raise at work, and they are not seeing any more efficiencies. All they are seeing is they have to reach down deeper and deeper into their pocket and pull out more and more money at the gas pump. Then there are people in Washington, D.C. that think it is a good idea to have policies that say we ought to raise taxes more on gasoline. Those policies and the policies of that admin-

istration are wrong. We should not be doing that. We have to worry about this economy.

Now, what can we do? We can all complain about gasoline prices and OPEC, and I can tell my colleagues that I have had experience with gasoline prices in Colorado. My district is the 3rd District of the State of Colorado. It is all the Rocky Mountains; almost all of the mountains in Colorado, and we have experienced high gasoline prices out there. Nothing like we are seeing today, but we have experienced those kind of prices.

But today's price is being driven by a cartel. We do not allow cartels in this country. It is a monopoly. We do not allow that. We have antitrust legislation in this country, so we do not have cartels that stick it to the people.

Now, some people say, well, it is the market. Let the market work. Well, let the market, if the market works in a true market form. I am a firm believer in Adam Smith. I am a strong believer in the philosophy of Adam Smith and capitalism and the market. But it is an unfair advantage in the market if we let a cartel go in. The cartel is not a concept of the market, and that is what is happening to your gasoline prices.

People say why is the price going up? Well, part of it is the policy of the administration, in my opinion, that I have stated my disagreement with. But the strongest push upward, the more immediate push upward that we have seen in the last few weeks is as a direct result of this cartel called OPEC.

Okay, well let us talk about the battle we are involved in. We have OPEC over here. It is a cartel. And as my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), said, Iran is a member of OPEC. We have a number of different countries, Algeria, Nigeria, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait. These countries all belong to this good old boy club. Now, surely some of us have heard, especially being in politics in an election year, we have to get rid of the good old boy club. There is not a better more definite example of the good old boy club than the cartel and OPEC. They are putting a noose around us and keep tightening the noose.

Well, does this country deserve to have a noose put around us? Let us take a look at some of the OPEC members. Kuwait, for example. Maybe we should dial up Kuwait on the telephone: Hey, Kuwait, how long is your memory? Was it not America that gave you your country back about 9 years ago? Was it not America that lost 50 or so soldiers giving you back your country? Was it not America that rebuilt your country? And this is how you express gratitude; you go into this cartel and say stick it to the Americans?

By the way, Saudi Arabia and Nigeria, and all these other countries of OPEC, whose expertise do you think

you are using for the mechanical aspects of taking that oil out of the ground, of transporting that oil, of marketing that oil?

We have had a good friendship over the years with many of those OPEC countries. It would be a shame if that friendship is allowed to be diluted by greed, which is the only bottom line when dealing with a cartel. Greed is the only bottom line that a cartel results in. It is the only result one gets with a cartel. It brings greed. And there are a lot of victims sacrificed as a result of greed.

What is my proposal? I think the President, and I have heard the comments of the administration, and I refer to the administration's policy. I am not referring to the President or Vice President personally, as my colleagues know, but the President and the Vice President's policies of saying we should not tamper with it, it is the market, let the market deal with this, is wrong. A cartel is not part of the market. And if the administration is going to consider it part of the market, then let us play by market rules, which means let us get in there and tussle a little. Let us get in that market and say, all right, if OPEC wants to charge us 20 some bucks or 25 bucks a barrel for oil, we are going to start taxing American products that go over to make it possible for them to produce that oil.

□ 2000

Now, starting tomorrow, if they want drill bits out of the United States to drill down, maybe we ought to charge them an extra premium to help us offset the fuel costs we are being dealt with.

They want to transport? If they are using any kind of American expertise or American personnel, maybe we ought to have a special little assessment, we will not call it a tax, an assessment to make it a little softer approach, let's call it an assessment. We are going to put an assessment on OPEC.

Two people can play this game. If OPEC wants to come in with a cartel to the free world and you want to put a stranglehold on us, it goes two ways. They are not totally independent of the United States. In fact, I say to OPEC and any number of those countries, not only was Kuwait dependent on the United States to free their country and give it back to them, all of those countries over there, without exception, all of them are dependent upon American expertise for their own economies.

Maybe we ought to play a little tit for tat, as they say. That is what they do in the market; they get competition out there. Let us compete. Let us not just say, well, the competition has put together this cartel so we will just let things kind of wander as they might, as we hear from the Vice President's administration.

Let us get out there and let us get in the ring with them. Let us take a look at foreign aid. Last year four countries, Algeria, Nigeria, Indonesia, and Venezuela, \$165 million in aid, \$165 million in aid to those four OPEC countries, foreign aid from the United States.

When our budget comes up this year, maybe we ought to take a look at the OPEC countries that we have in our budget that we are giving money to to help with their problems under our foreign aid program; and maybe we ought to remember what they are doing to us, to the American citizens, to the hard working people that have to get to work every day, turn on their lights, feed a family, maybe we ought to remember what they are doing to us when we do our foreign aid bill this year. I think it is important.

I think these gasoline prices will have a negative impact on our economy. It is nothing to laugh at. It is not something, as the administration says, well, we will just kind of let it go, you know, let the market take place.

If we had a true market form the way that Adam Smith talked about a true market, we would not have a cartel out there, competition would be allowed to thrive, and we would not have this kind of situation occurring.

The administration has got to recognize they do not have an Adam Smith type of playing field out there, they have got a cartel. And that is what is jacking up the price to the American people. The American people deserve an aggressive behavior out of its Nation's capital before our economy begins to crumble as a result of these oil prices.

And we have got the leverage to do it. It is not like we are totally disarmed in this battle. We have got lots of leverage. That foreign aid is just one small part of it. American expertise is a big part of it. What we do for those countries is a big part of the leverage we have. We ought to put it all on the table. They laid out their cards. They got together and decided which cards were best to play poker with. And so, instead of playing poker with each one of them, they all got together and put their cards and are coming up with the best hand.

Well, they do not have all the leverage. We have got some leverage. I urge my colleagues, let us get aggressive. Let us not sit back and take it. Let us get aggressive on this. We have got leverage, and let us use it.

CASE OF THE WEEK

I am going to change horses here for a minute. I want to talk about my crazy case of the week. First a little of my background.

As I said before, I used to be a police officer. And you cannot ever get that out of your blood. By the way, I want to say to my colleagues, of course, I am from Colorado. I was a police officer in

Colorado. I have got a number of good colleagues out there who still are on the force. And just a message to all law enforcement across the country, my constituents' colleagues, they have got our full support. We love good cops. We do not like bad cops, but we love good cops. And they deserve the kind of credibility that they have.

In most communities, I guess I should take that back, in every community, overall there is strong respect and admiration for our police officers.

Let me tell my colleagues about a case that I read about in the Denver Post. I will cite the article. Denver Post, March 11. That was last Saturday. This case involves a defendant who is accused of murder.

This defendant went out and allegedly, and everything I say this evening is allegedly, although the evidence, in my opinion, proves it up, but the decision has not yet been made, so it is all allegedly, let us take that into consideration, this defendant allegedly goes out with one of his buddies and decides that they want to go ahead and rape a woman. And, of course, if you rape them, you better murder her, too.

So they go out and hit a jogger with their car. They hit a jogger with the car. The jogger falls, gets cut up and things. And this defendant jumps out and says how apologetic he is that he hit her with his car and he offers to take her to the hospital. Good Samaritan, I am sorry I hit with you with my car. Let me take you to the hospital.

The smartest thing that woman ever did was say, no, I will get my own help. I do not need your help. I am not going to let you take me to the hospital.

So that victim did not work out. So then they go on down and they find another victim, a 23-year-old young woman. They take her. They rape her. They beat her. They abuse her. They torture her. Then they murder her.

Well, let me tell my colleagues what the defense is saying. Now, I have got to tell my colleagues, in fair disclosure, I did used to be a cop. I am biased toward the prosecution side. I used to be an attorney. I practiced law. I could not practice defense law. I mean, I know that they are entitled to a defense, but, as an attorney, I chose not to do defense law because I just could not find myself defending somebody whom the facts made very clear were guilty.

But that is an aside. An attorney has an obligation to defend its client. I just could not do that kind of work. But I do disclose to all of my colleagues, I have a bent towards the prosecution. But these are facts out of the newspaper. This is not the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) coming up with an idea. These are facts out of the newspaper.

So they go and rape this person. The defense puts on their case. And guess what the defense says? Oh, the defendant, this guy that did this, he thought

he was the victim. He thought in his mind, and this is true, this is what the psychiatrist testifies to, that in his mind he thought he was being raped. In his mind, he thought she, the true victim, the murder victim, he thought she was causing infidelity in his marriage and he just did not really know what he was doing when he killed her because he thought he was the victim and he was trying to push her away from raping him and from causing an extra-marital affair in his marriage. It is incredible.

Dr. Riyana Rogers, a forensic psychiatrist who currently works as a professor at the University of California in San Francisco, let me tell my colleagues something, I hope I get the opportunity some day to meet her or that my colleagues get an opportunity to ask her about this defense.

Come on, folks. Can you really think that a mental illness will allow a defendant, who earlier in the day, by the way, earlier in the day very methodically tried to get a woman in his car. He hit her with his car. By the way, I should also add this fact: A year earlier they had a witness testify that he dreamed or had a fantasy of going out and grabbing a woman and raping her. He said he wanted to rape a girl and kill her and make her boyfriend watch, according to videotaped testimony.

And yet, this psychiatrist comes to the common people of America and says, look, I am sorry that the victim got raped. I am sorry that the woman got raped. I am sorry that the woman was abused. I am sorry that the woman was tortured. I am sorry that the woman was killed. But, you know, in this case the real victim was this guy. I know he is the one that killed her. Yeah, he killed her. But he is the victim. He thought he was getting raped. He thought she was disrobing him. He thought he was being tortured. He thought it was his marriage that would suffer as a result of this situation. So he called upon himself to justify it.

Well, I am telling my colleagues, it makes me sick. Now, the jury is still out on this. I hope the jury does not buy it. If the jury buys it, I can tell my colleagues this will be one of the saddest chapters in American defense law in the history of this country. I said "defense," not prosecution, "defense." Because it does a disfavor to your industry to their profession, and I used to be an attorney, it does a disfavor to their profession if somebody is going to get off the hook by claiming that, in fact, they were the victim of the rape, they were the victim and blame it on the sweet child of 23 who never saw another day.

That is the case of the week.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Next, I want to visit for a minute about law enforcement. I want to thank especially the Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

Senator CAMPBELL and I worked very intensely, as maybe my colleagues know, on the appropriations bill. We put appropriations in starting about 3 years ago. We have got it in every year since. Senator CAMPBELL, on the Senate side, has done a tremendous job for this, I on the House side. And it is the Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. We have Garfield, Eagle, Rio Blanco Counties are participating on a tri-county team, along with the communities in there.

For example, my good friend Terry Wilson, the chief of police of the Glenwood Springs Police Department, I used to be on that department, I worked with the gentleman, he is doing a great job. And I want my colleagues to know here, this is a good program.

What we have done is we have focused in on high drug trafficking corridors. We have given local money. We have not come in and said, we know better. The Federal Government has not sent in a bunch of agents and said, we know how to tell local law enforcement to do their job.

What we have done is made available expertise and put money into those communities so that those communities can go out onto their highways, into their counties, into their cities on these corridors and intercede that drug trafficking. And it has been a great success. I want to acknowledge that success this evening.

AMERICA WANTS SOLUTION TO GUN PROBLEM

Now I want to talk about guns. We have seen a lot of tragedy in this country. We have seen a lot of debate. Unfortunately, a lot of it is being motivated by politics. But we have seen a lot of debates on guns in this country. And there has been opportunities for exaggerations on both sides of this debate on guns.

There is a problem out there. Now, a lot of people will go with the satisfaction of just having the debate itself so they think they can score political points. But the core of America, the core of America, wants a solution to this problem. They want us to work out something that makes sense that will work.

□ 2015

I think there are a number of people across this country that have come up with an answer that does work. I think it is being completely ignored, most specifically by the national media. I must say that in Colorado, the local media has done strong justification to the program that I am going to talk about.

Let me give a little brief history of the program that I want to visit about, but first of all let us talk a little more, very briefly, about this gun issue. My position has always been, as a Congressman and as a State representative for years before that, that it is the misuse of the weapon that we must focus

on. Putting all your attention on possession of the weapon it is a distraction. It is not the possession of the weapon that creates the problem. It is the misuse of that weapon that creates the bigger problem, in my opinion.

How do you deal with misuse?

Now, this sounds simple. It is so simple, you are going to say, right, get on to the next point; but the fact is when you have misuse you have to go after it. You cannot have misuse of a weapon, misuse of a gun, and ignore it, because the misuse will only grow unproportionately. You have to go after the misuse. That is a simple rule, rule number one, go after the misuse.

Number two, what do you do about the misuse? How do you go after it? Well, I am going to go through a project that I think is very effective in going after it, but there are other things. This project incorporates all of them. One, be quick, swift. If you see misuse, if you see misbehavior, move quickly to stop it. You must intercede quickly. Delay of time works against you. You must intercede quickly. You must intercede with significant force. I don't mean you call in the Army. I am just saying that you have to be able to reach out there and grab that misuse and stop it.

So, one, you have to go after it; two, you have to do it quickly; and, three, you have to have significant ability to stop it, to enforce it. It is very much like touching a hot burner.

That is an experience that all of us have had at some point in our early years. The elements of touching a hot burner are contained within this project that I am going to go through with you, but I think it is the answer. Instead of talking about, well, we should have this and we should have more laws on the books here and more laws on the books there, let me say politically it sounds great, but it is a distraction. It is going after possession.

Let us go after misuse and let us compare it to a burner, a hot burner. A hot burner is very, very dangerous. A gun misused is very, very dangerous. A car driven at a high speed or misused is very, very dangerous. You must have consequences if you are going to stop that misuse.

Well, take a look at a hot burner. First of all, there is a warning. Now, the first time you touch it, you probably did not know the difference when you were very, very small, between a red hot burner and a burner that was just black, it was not red in its color. So you walk up to a burner and it is red. Well, after the first time that signal alone will send little signals to your brain, trouble ahead, trouble ahead, there is a hot burner; do not touch that burner.

The first time that signal did not go up because it was not implanted. The impression was not made on your mind what a red burner meant. We are going

to place impressions on minds with this project. We are going to take care of that. We want people to see the red burner.

The second thing you did when you did not recognize that the red burner was a signal that there is danger is you approached it; and as you approached it, you began to feel heat. The heat was of little consequence because you did not really know what it meant. You knew it meant heat as a small child. So you kept going to the burner and you touched it.

What happened when you touched that burner? There were immediate impressions made on your mind. Ouch, ouch, it hurt. The response was immediate, the consequence was immediate, and the impression on your mind lasted you for the rest of your life: do not ever touch a red hot burner.

Today I want to talk a little about Project Exile. That is the red hot burner. We want people out there to know, Mr. Speaker, that it is red hot; and if you touch it, it is going to burn and the consequences are going to be severe because we want to create an impression in your mind that the misuse or the illegal use of weapons or guns in this country will not be tolerated; zero tolerance.

It does not require new laws, by the way, no new laws, no new gun laws, none of this stuff. Put all the political argument aside. By the way, this project is supported non-partisanly. I will talk later about my friend Ken Salazar in the State of Colorado, the attorney general; a little later about Tom Strickland and all of the attorneys general who work for him who have done a tremendous job, the same thing with the Colorado State attorney generals there, attorneys there who have done a good job. We have a lot of Republicans in there. Wayne LaPierre, head of the NRA, is involved in this, our governor, of course, in the State of Colorado, Bill Owens, a tremendous leader for the State of Colorado. He is involved in it. It is bipartisan.

Let me begin by starting with a little brief history on where it started. It actually started in the East, in Virginia. Now, you are talking to SCOTT MCINNIS. It takes me a lot to credit something beginning in the East. I am strong on the West, but this one started in the East. It started in Richmond, Virginia.

What happened in 1997 is Richmond suffered from the second highest per capita murder rate in the country, second highest rate in the country. So they decided to put together a project they called Project Exile; and in 1998, as a result of this project, the city's homicides were cut by 33 percent, the lowest they had had since 1987, all as a result of Project Exile.

Project Exile, what is it? What does it mean? It is a Federal, State, and local effort. It is not just a Federal ef-

fort. The Feds are not coming into your State, into your community, into your county telling you what to do. They are working a partnership. This is a partnership. The Feds, they are a partnership with the State; and they are a partnership with the local government.

The effort in Colorado, as it was in Virginia, was led by the United States Attorney General's office. Those are the ones who prosecute, from a Federal level, gun crimes. Where do we come up with the name "exile"? What we wanted, and I say "we," I wanted a part of it, I just think it is a wonderful program and that is why I am promoting it; but the reason the word "exile" came is if you violate a gun law, if you misuse that weapon, and violate that gun law, you are going to be exiled to prison, exiled to prison. Thus, the name Project Exile; Colorado Project Exile.

In this particular case in the history, it started in Virginia, but this is what many of our billboards in Colorado are going to look like, just exactly like this, pack an illegal gun, i.e., misuse, misuse, abuse of the law, touch the burner, pack your bags for prison; and then report illegal guns, we give a 1-800 number. It has been so successful this Project Exile in Virginia that it has been implemented in Boston, it has been implemented in New Orleans, in Rochester, in Birmingham, in Baltimore and many other cities across the country, and now we in Colorado have adopted this and I urge my colleagues on the House floor, take a look at it for their own State.

Look, there is a lot of rhetoric going on out there about these guns, and there have been some tragedies. There have always been tragedies with guns, misuse of guns; but put all the rhetoric aside. I have seen some rhetoric over the weekend, and most of it seems to focus on possession. We have the laws in place. We have a lot of gun laws in this country, and a lot of those laws are good laws. They make sense. For example, you cannot have an automatic machine gun. It makes sense.

We have a lot of laws that make sense. You cannot misuse a gun, you cannot use a gun in a robbery, in this and that. It makes sense. Let us use them. Let us let people know that we mean business when we talk about gun laws.

Well, Colorado Project Exile had a press conference last week. The NRA was there. I know some of you every time you mention the NRA your hair bristles. Other people stand up and clap. That was one side that was there.

The U.S. Attorney's Office was there. The Colorado attorney general, who is a Democrat, Ken Salazar; and I applaud my colleague who does a darn good job in Colorado, he was there. MARK, my colleague here on the House floor, MARK was there; Tom Strickland, U.S.

attorney, State of Colorado, he was there and his staff was there. By the way, a lot of Ken's staff was there. Of course, the governor led off on this thing. Bill Owens has done a tremendous job for us.

The sheriff's department was there. Police departments were there. The Colorado state patrol was there. Lee White, an individual in Colorado who has put a lot of effort in helping us raise money, they have gone out and raised money to take this campaign to the people; go out to the people and tell them, the burner is hot. It is red hot. If you touch it, you will be exiled into pain. In this particular case you are going to be exiled into prison.

Well, the project has multiple aspects to it; but the goal of the project is this, this is our goal in Project Exile: raise the stakes. You break a gun law in Colorado, we are raising the stakes. The citizens of Colorado are going to raise the stakes at the poker table. No longer are we just going to talk about issues like possession. We are going to raise the stakes, and we are going to look at the laws we have. We are going to make it very painful for you to violate gun laws in the State of Colorado. We want to make that burner hot. We want to make it red hot. We want it very clear that if you violate Federal or State gun laws you will go to prison.

One of the ways that we are going to do it is we are getting a message out there. We really have three components to it. Remember at the beginning of my comments, Mr. Speaker, I talked about the gun squads. Gun squads, you said? What is he doing on the House floor talking about gun squads? Sounds like some kind of gun fanatic out there. No. We have a new gun squad, just like the vice squad. Vice squad goes after things, the drug squad goes after things, the traffic squad goes after things. Well, now the gun squad.

Remember everything I am telling you about was supported by everybody from the NRA clear over to the State patrol, the city police, Democrats, Republicans. We are going to have a gun squad, and they are going to be looking for people violating those gun laws. If you are packing an illegal gun, if you are breaking a law like that, you are going to pay the consequences, so be ready. It is fair game; you are fair game. We have to let those constituents out there who think they are going to get away with violating those laws, who think we are going to ignore the fact that we have lots of laws on the books, we are going to let them know we mean business. That burner will be hot.

So our gun squad will consist of a cooperative effort from our partnership with the Federal, the State and the local, to go out and coordinate our gun laws. For example, I will give you an example, every police officer in the State of Colorado will be given this

placard. Now, this placard has the gun laws.

You are saying, Scott, why do you give this placard on gun laws to the State Patrol, for example, or to the Grand Junction Police Department or people like that? Why do you give them this placard?

This is not State gun law. This is a quick summary of Federal gun laws. Every police officer will have this; and they will be able to, when they make a stop or when they come into a situation, they will be able to very quickly figure out if there is a gun law, Federal gun law, violation that has taken place.

Remember, they already know their city ordinances, city laws. They know the State laws, but really they do not have right at their hand, right in their palm, the Federal gun laws. Now they will have it, and they will be able to immediately know if we have a situation that the gun squad ought to look at. Our effort is to coordinate the gun laws at the local level, the gun laws at the State level, and the gun laws at the Federal level so that we can come up with the maximum temperature on that burner so that the person who continues to misbehave in our society and causes us a lot of grief, I mean talk about the challenge to the second amendment; I am a strong supporter of the second amendment. You talk about a challenge to the second amendment, it is these people out there that are breaking the laws that make other people in our society think that it is the second amendment that is the cause.

□ 2030

The cause is that our coordination has not taken place. We are not making that burner hot enough. We are not making it hot enough for those people that violate the laws.

Well, secondly, of course, the second thing goes along on the enforcement. I have told you this, those officers will have this. We are doing lots of educational seminars in Colorado. We have citizens in Colorado, not just cops, not just lawmakers, and I have many, many good colleagues in the State house and State Senate in Colorado that support this. We are getting common people out there to go out and raise money to help us make the public, and, in this particular case, the law enforcement agencies, aware that, number one, we are behind you. You men and women out there have got a tough job on the street. You need to know that we are going to stand behind you, and we are going to stand behind you on this one. We are there. We are there with you.

Two, we are going to make information accessible to you.

Three, once you go through this effort, we are going to follow through with the prosecution side of it. We are going to go after this.

The third element we need to talk about is public awareness. This is not just a fancy poster to bring on to the House floor. This is a duplicate copy of what our billboards and what our advertising program is going to be like in the State of Colorado.

Now, I say "ours." It is ours. It is the people of the State of Colorado. In fact, it is the people of the United States of America focusing in Colorado, or in Baltimore, or in West Virginia. It is your taxpayer dollars in the U.S. Attorney's Office.

But in Colorado our project is going to read Colorado, Project Exile. Remember what exile means. You violate the law, you do the crime, you do the time, except this time we are going to do something. We are really doing it. Pack an illegal gun, pack your bags for prison, and a 1-800 number. I will talk about that later.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in the state legislature in the 1980s we decided we were going to get tough on guns. We decided we were going to get tough on crime. We decided we were going to get tough on judges who we did not think were doing an adequate enough job of being tough on these people.

We toughened up in Colorado. We built prisons and we sent people to prisons and our crime rate dropped like a rock in water. Why? Because they knew there were consequences. They knew the punishment would be there and they knew it would be fairly immediate and it worked in Colorado.

Now, look, I have heard the age-old argument, well, look, Scott McInnis in Colorado has the wrong idea. Build more schools and less prisons.

Mr. Speaker, that is comparing apples to oranges. Who does not want to build more schools? Who does not support stronger education? But the finest education system in the world in a society that has it, and I happen to think the United States, when you look at the overall picture of education, I think we have one of the finest systems in the world, still has got people that are going to misbehave.

The Catholic priesthood is one of the finest callings man could go to, in my opinion. I am a Catholic. But if you are Jewish, maybe a Rabbi, or whatever. It is one of the finest callings you can go to, but you have bad people. No matter how well you educate a Catholic priest, no matter how well you educate a Rabbi, or no matter how well you educate your general population, you are going to have some bad apples out there, and some of these apples are animals, just like the fellow I mentioned before, who declares he is the victim because he raped a woman, murdered her and tortured her. She was not the victim; he was the victim. That guy ought to be in prison. I do not care what kind of school you build in Colorado, you are not going to do much with this guy.

Face the fact that a certain percentage of your population you are going to have to deal, you are going to have to have consequences.

So that is what we are doing. We are saying you are going to go to prison. We are not going to go out and rehabilitate you, we are not going to go out and doodle around and slap you on the hand and tell you we are going to look the other way, although in the past I can tell you very few gun laws in the State of Colorado in my opinion were enforced. We looked the other way. Too much hassle. "It's okay. Old Joe here has got to use this weapon in a robbery or something, let's get him on a robbery."

Well, things have changed. Now, tragedy, of course, has created this change. Not just tragedy at Columbine, we all know about that, but tragedy in the other cases too, and it is time for the whole Nation, every one of my colleagues sitting on this floor, to change, not change, because I know you are supportive, I do not know anybody that is not, let us use the laws we have got. Let us go after them.

Let us talk about the 1-800 number. "Report illegal guns, 1-800-283-guns." Where did that come from? Remember the program, maybe you have seen it in your neighborhood, I have got it in my neighborhood, neighborhood watch, the neighborhood watch program? Or crime watchers, where you call in. You do not have to give your name, and we put rewards out there?

We went out in law enforcement, I used to be a cop, we went out there and recognized, you know, we do not know it all. We cannot do it all. We have got to form a partnership. We need to form a partnership with our citizens. We need to reach out to our citizens and ask them to help us. That is where crime watchers came, that is where neighborhood watch came about, and that is exactly what is going to happen with Colorado Project Exile. We are asking for your help.

We are going to give you a 1-800 number. If you know somebody that is carrying an illegal weapon, you know somebody that used a weapon in a crime, you know somebody that has a fully automatic weapon that is illegal, call us, 1-800. No expense. No cost. You are helping yourself, you are helping your society. Call us. We mean business. You call us. Let us prove to you we are not going to tolerate this kind of behavior in society. We have got some good solid laws on the books.

I want to remind everybody, the National Rifle Association supports this. This is not something that has got a polarization going on out there. There is a lot of polarization today. I just saw it over the weekend. The President's policies are this, somebody else's policies are this, the Vice President is demanding apologies.

Forget all of that rhetoric. Let us talk about right here. This is it. This is

a policy that works. It is nonpartisan. It reaches out and brings lots of partners into our partnership, and our partnership is a strong partnership, as witnessed by the number of people that were at that press conference last week in Colorado announcing the kickoff.

Now, has it made a difference? You bet it has.

Remember, the press conference was last week, the statewide effort. Tom Strickland, the U.S. Attorney in the State of Colorado, actually initiated this in October of last year.

Let me tell you, first of all, has it been accepted by the public in Colorado? I have talked to you about how all the leaders have come together in a non-polarized partnership and formed a team. But have the people who we work for, have they accepted it?

The answer in Colorado is yes. The media has accepted it. Denver Post, Denver Rocky Mountain News, Colorado Springs Gazette, Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, Boulder Daily Camera, I could go on and on. This has strong support in Colorado.

In 1998, let me give you a few examples, these are some statistics. Primary charge, weapons used to facilitate drug trafficking. In 1998, eight people were charged. In 1999, 36 were charged. Project Exile was only in effect for 3 months.

Another startling statistic. A felon in possession of a gun, in 1998, 17 people, in Colorado, we have 3 million people, we got a lot of felons. Colorado is a great State, do not get me every wrong, but every State has felons out there, too many felons, and we know those felons, we know more than 17 felons had guns in their possession.

Well, now we are going to know a lot more, because we are getting participation from the community and from the law enforcement agencies and from the prosecutors and from the Federal Government with its assistance. Now we know we are going to find out a lot more about these felons. That number jumped by 30 percent, by 30 percent, and we were only in effect for 3 months.

We have a number of others. But let me just give you an idea. Here are some crimes in Colorado that recently charges have been filed under Operation Project Exile. In my opinion and in the expert opinion of the U.S. Attorney's Office and other people who really are in the field hands-on, these charges would not have been filed in Colorado, would not have been filed in Colorado, had it not been for our team effort on Colorado Project Exile.

What are they? I will give you an example. Delivery of a firearm to a common carrier without notice. Illegal exportation of guns via commercial airliners to Honduras. They were exporting illegal weapons to Honduras. Had this project not been in effect starting in October of last year, our guess is

charges would never have been filed under this law.

Possession of two sawed-off shotguns. We know sawed-off shotguns are illegal. It has been a long time since there were charges filed. Project Exile, we are filing charges. We filed them.

Possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, possessed an Uzi and a sawed-off shotgun and had domestic violence convictions and attempted third degree assault charges. All of those were wrapped up under Colorado Project Exile. Our belief is that most of those charges would not have been filed, had we not decided to take an aggressive, very aggressive, stance on the existing gun laws.

Drug user, addict in possession of a firearm, marijuana and methamphetamines, while possessing explosive devices and possession of unregistered firearms, destructive devices. In the past we think that it was too complicated or the coordination was not right or the team was not in place. We think in this particular case those charges would have been overlooked. Not under Colorado Project Exile.

Possession of a firearm by a prohibited person. Possessed a 9 millimeter semiautomatic assault weapon and had a misdemeanor domestic violence conviction. Another case, look the other way. Not intentionally look the other way, but the sophistication, the teamwork was not there, the commitment to aggressively go after the laws that already exist was not there. It is all there now.

I stress to you, one of our biggest partners are our constituents. This is not isolated to the police department or to the U.S. Attorney's Office or to Ken Salazar at the State Attorney General Office or our Governor. This is statewide.

Possession of a firearm by an illegal alien. Federal firearm license, selling to a non-resident of Colorado, failure on the background check and selling to a convicted felon.

So you can see, I have got page after page after page of violations we think will now be aggressively pursued against the people who decide that their misbehavior is something that society is going to have to tolerate. Their theory is, "Hey, I do what I want to do. If I want to carry around a sawed-off shotgun or misuse a weapon, society is going to have to adapt to my behavior." Well, we have got news for you. You are going to adapt to society's behavior.

Let me say in conclusion, this Project Exile is not an attack on the Second Amendment. I am a strong believer in that. In fact, I think it helps us support the Second Amendment. This Project Exile is not ignorance of the problems we have out there of the tragedy. In fact, I think it is going to do a lot more to avert tragedies and to

get our hands on these tragedies that are taking place than any of the rhetoric going on right now in the Nation by the highest levels of our administration.

This is going to get things done. This is not talk. Talk is cheap. This is going to get things done. It has got support of the major law enforcement agencies in Colorado, from your local police department to the Attorney General, to the U.S. Attorney General's office. It has got the Governor. It has got Democrats and Republicans in the State house and the State senate supporting it.

In fact, maybe the best way to summarize, I have not found anybody who objects to it. I have not found anybody who says to ignore the laws, the laws in existence on the books now. In fact, my friends who support the Second Amendment, one of their basic points is let us see what happens when we enforce the laws we currently have on the books. Let us see what happens when we make the consequences of touching a burner immediate and painful. Their bet, my bet, everyone involved in this, the bet is you will not touch that burner again, and society will be better for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all colleagues, in their respective districts, in their respective States, go out there, talk to their Attorney General. If you are Republicans, talk to the Democrats. If you are Democrat, talk to the Republican leaders in your State. Form a team like we did in Colorado and put in your own Project Exile. My bet, and I think it is a safe bet, and I am a betting man and I like safe bets, my bet is that after 1 year you will find out that your Project Exile has accomplished more than all of the rhetoric combined for all of the States.

□ 2045

But the rhetoric aside, put the action in place. You pack an illegal gun; you pack your bags for prison.

CHARACTER EDUCATION IN OUR SCHOOLS: AN INNOVATION THAT WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk with my colleagues about the future. As I talk about the future, I want to talk about the children of this country, because they truly are our future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about education, particularly an effort in education called character education. We talk about a lot of things that work and things that do